

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 and 40-53 are pending. Claim 23 is cancelled herein. Claims 3, 18, 40, 42, and 43 have been amended.

The amendments to claims 3 and 18 are supported by the specification, at least at page 5, lines 5-8. The amendments to claims 3 and 18 correct an inadvertent clerical mistake and broaden the claims to the extent supported by the specification. The amendments to claims 40, 42, and 43 correct informalities to which the Examiner objected and do not narrow the scope of the claims. The amendment to claim 42 is supported by the specification, at least at page 1, lines 18-20, and page 8, lines 22-25. The amendment to claim 43 is supported by the specification, at least at page 1, lines 26-29, and page 8, line 29 through page 9, line 1. The amendment to claim 40 is supported by the specification, at least at page 5, lines 23-27. The amendment to claim 40 further incorporates claim 23 into claim 40. Claim 23 has been cancelled. No new matter has been introduced. Applicants kindly request the Examiner to enter these amendments. Attached herewith is a marked-up version of the changes made to the claims by these amendments. The attached page is captioned "VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE."

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Prebilic for indicating that the drawings have been approved by the Draftsman and by the Examiner.

The objections to claims 40-53 have been obviated by appropriate amendment. Language similar to that suggested by the Examiner has been incorporated into claims 40, 42, and 43.

The rejection of claims 4-7 and 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 has been obviated by appropriate amendment of the claims from which they respectively depend.

The rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been obviated by appropriate amendment. The claim has been cancelled.

The rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully traversed. Claims 1, 2, 14-17, 23, and 40-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Cumming (U.S. Pat. No. 5,047,051) in view of Cahalan *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,415,938). However, the claims require a polyimide coating on at least a portion of the intraocular lens, which is not taught by the cited references as explained below.

The Examiner asserts that Cahalan teaches that it was known to coat intraocular lenses with a "polyimide or an imide containing polymer." Rather, Cahalan discloses the coating of biomaterials with a "polyalkylimine" (column 2, lines 27-39, and column 4, lines 44-57). As shown on page 599 of Allcock, H.R. et al. *Contemporary Polymer Chemistry*, 2nd Ed. (1990), attached hereto as Exhibit A, polyalkylamines are different from polyimides both in chemical structure and physical properties. The "imides" referred to in Cahalan, pointed to by the Examiner, are not "polyimides" or their precursors, but rather are small molecule coupling reagents, i.e. carbodiimides, for securing the alkylimine and/or a biomolecule to the surface, as in Example 2 of Cahalan. It is well known to use carbodiimides as coupling reagents, especially in peptide synthesis, as discussed in pages 1-6 and 31-33 of Stewart et al. *Solid Phase Peptide Synthesis*, 2nd Ed. (1984), attached hereto as Exhibit B. But an imide coupling agent is not a "polyimide" or its precursor. Accordingly, Cumming and Cahalan together do not teach the coating of biomaterials such as intraocular lenses with polyimides or

imide containing polymers. Therefore, claims 1, 2, 14-17, 23, and 40-43 are patentable over these references.

This combination of Cumming and Cahalan also forms the basis for the rejection of claim 8; the rejection of claims 9, 12, 13, 44-46, and 49-53; and the rejection of claims 9-11 and 46-48, all under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), in combination with other secondary references. These rejections are traversed for the reasons stated above. Applicants request the Examiner to acknowledge that these claims are likewise patentable.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Marc V. Richards", written over a horizontal line.

Marc V. Richards
Registration No. 37,921
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

In the Claims:

Claim 23 has been canceled.

The claims have been amended as follows:

3. (Amended) The intraocular lens of claim 1 wherein the optic and haptic core comprise a silicone polymer, acrylic polymer, hydroacrylic polymer, 2-hydroxyethylmethacrylate polymer or [and] polymethylmethacrylate polymer.

18. (Amended) The intraocular lens of claim 16 wherein the optic and haptic core comprise a silicone polymer, acrylic polymer, hydroacrylic polymer, 2-hydroxyethylmethacrylate polymer or [and] polymethylmethacrylate polymer.

40. (Amended) A [The] device [of claim 23] for implantation in a human to be anchored in a secured position within human tissue, the device comprising:

a biologically inert exterior surface region; and

a polyimide coating on at least a portion of said region, the coating sufficient to be effective to promote fibrosis of the surrounding tissue with the polyimide to enhance the anchoring of the device to the surrounding tissue;

wherein the device is shaped in the form of [comprises] an intraocular lens, the intraocular lens comprising an optic and at least one haptic, the haptic having a core, wherein said polyimide coating is on said core.

42. (Amended) The device of claim 40, wherein the haptic is shaped in the form of a filament.

43. (Amended) The device of claim 40, comprising two [plate] haptics shaped in the form of a plate, diametrically opposed and extending radially away from the optic, the haptics having a groove in a distal peripheral edge, the groove having the polyimide material [place] therein.